



Leadership Gloucestershire – 27 October 2016

1 Welcome, introduction and apologies

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
Cllr Mark Hawthorne (Chair) Pete Bungard	Gloucestershire County Council	
Cllr Steve Lydon David Hagg	Stroud DC	
Cllr Dave Norman Anne Brinkhoff	Gloucester City Council	Cllr Paul James Jon McGinty
Cllr Patrick Molyneux	Forest of Dean DC	Peter Williams
Cllr Steve Jordan Pat Pratley	Cheltenham BC	
Cllr Christopher Hancock Christine Gore	Cotswold DC	
Cllr Robert Vines Rachel North	Tewkesbury BC	Mike Dawson
Martin Surl Richard Bradley	PCC Office	Paul Trott
Suzette Davenport	Gloucestershire Constabulary	
Dr Andy Seymour Mary Hutton	NHS Gloucestershire CCG	
David Owen	GFirst LEP	Diane Savory
	Government representative – Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS)	Katie Jenkins
Jane Burns Jo Walker Neil Corbett Simon Harper	Gloucestershire County Council	
John Bensted	Independent Adviser, Community Safety	

2 LAST MEETING

2.1 Action notes

The notes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016 were agreed.

2.2 Actions arising

Relevant actions had been taken following the last meeting.

3 COMMUNITY SAFETY REVIEW

Richard Bradley stated that the review commissioned by Leadership Gloucestershire had been undertaken by John Bensted. It was the first time in 20 years that there had been an opportunity to do a 'whole systems' review of community safety.

John Bensted said that it was evident that there were some strong partnerships that were working well but there were also frustrations about duplication and gaps in provision. He stated that he had been encouraged by the enthusiasm amongst public agencies for working together.

John believed that there was a need for an overarching county partnership to work collaboratively and provide strong strategic leadership whilst at the same time enabling locality activities. He referred specifically to domestic homicide reviews and finding ways to share learning across the county.

The planning cycle for community safety needed to be improved to allow the best use of the information available through the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JNSA) and related data sources.

Strong links needed to be made with the Health and Wellbeing Board, the Criminal Justice Board, the Police and Crime Plan and asset based community development.

The consultation feedback indicated that everyone wanted to see some sort of change to improve the way that community safety was provided across the county. A number of respondents believed that the current arrangements were complex, uncoordinated and lacked strategic leadership. There were areas of overlap and other areas where there was duplication. There remained a large number of groups across the county and some respondents believed that there was significant scope for rationalisation. Concerns had also been expressed around 'silo working' in some agencies.

Three options had been included as part of the consultation:

Option 1 represented a relatively minor change with six district-based community safety partnerships remaining in place but with a regular forum for chairs to meet.

Option 2 involved the establishment of a county-wide community safety partnership working closely with the six district-based community safety partnerships.

Option 3 represented transformational change with the merger of the six district-based community safety partnerships to form an overarching county partnership. Six district-based multi-agency forums would allow activities to be customised at a local level. Key forums relating to priority areas would have a direct relationship with the county-wide partnership. These included public protection, anti-social behavior, drugs and alcohol, domestic abuse and sexual violence, domestic homicide reviews, hate crime, anti-slavery and organised crime.

The responses showed strongest support for the transformational change offered by option 3.

Nine of the 10 partners around the table broadly supported option 3. It was felt that there were notable gaps in the current approach, particularly around intelligence gathering and data sharing. The new approach needed to be driven from the bottom up with the key focus on improving services for local communities.

Cllr Steve Lydon had concerns around the evidence base used in developing the new arrangements. He had particular concerns around youth justice, homelessness and care leavers. He said that the current approach to community safety in Stroud was recognised as best practice and he was anxious that this was not lost under any new structure.

Answering questions, John Bensted acknowledged the strength of the Stroud Community Safety Partnership and he could not see any issues with it continuing to operate within option 3. Martin Surl, who's office had offered to manage the county-wide partnership, believed that option 3 would be flexible enough to incorporate the partnership arrangements already in place in Stroud.

Agreed

- a) *To support the principles included in option 3 in establishing a Gloucestershire Community Safety Partnership.*
- b) *To provide financial support of £35,000 from historic Local Area Agreement Reward Grant to deliver the implementation phase.*

c) *To support the offer from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to manage and administer the new partnership.*

Action – Richard Bradley

4 SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION PLAN (STP)

Mary Hutton made a PowerPoint presentation providing the background to the STP process, the shared vision for Gloucestershire, the Joining Up Your Care Plan, the financial challenge and system enablers. The Joining Up Your Care Plan covered enabling active communities, the clinical programme approach, reducing clinical variation and 'one place, one budget, one system'. The system enablers were workforce and organisational development, quality academy, programme development and governance models, joint IT strategy, primary care strategy and joint estates' strategy.

Answering questions, Mary said that she expected the STP to be published in about a week. She advised that there were an increasing number of joint posts between the NHS and the County Council. A Director of Integration would shortly be appointed to lead on the integration of health and social care. In coming weeks, there would be engagement on changes to urgent care and there would be an opportunity for partners to give their views.

Partners recognised that the STP was not about reductions to funding but about responding to changing needs and increasing demand for services. There needed to be a positive message to local people about the steps being taken to respond to the changing demand for services.

5 KPMG REVIEW

Pete Bungard stated that the KPMG review had found that the original devolution bid was strong with a good focus on skills, infrastructure, housing and employment. A few additional asks of Government were suggested but on public service reform the county already had the powers necessary. The concept of a Combined Authority governance model was owned by all partners and would take devolution and public service reform forward, but to do this there was a clear need for dedicated capacity. It was proposed that each of the 10 partners provide funding of £10,000. Direct funding by each partner would demonstrate their commitment towards devolution.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that the KPMG Leaders' workshop held in the Summer had identified the need for a dedicated resource to drive the devolution process forward. He said that the resource would be owned collectively by Leadership Gloucestershire and would allow a devolution proposal to be properly structured and packaged. If the county was 'deal ready' then it could move forward quickly when the Government provided an

appropriate opportunity. The £10,000 funding was in effect the cost of a ticket so that Leadership Gloucestershire could buy a collective resource to take the devolution process forward.

David Hagg advised that the district chief executives had met beforehand and questions had been raised on how the funding would be used to address priority areas. He said that there was a strong argument that work associated with devolution should continue to be part of the day-to-day role of senior officers in each organisation. He noted that in-house expertise was already available in priority areas such as strategic planning and housing. Pat Pratley stated that she was prepared to reshuffle resources at Cheltenham BC to allow officers with particular expertise to focus on devolution activities.

Cllr Chris Hancock recognised that the picture was complex and went beyond district planning issues. He believed that dedicated resources would need to be made available for both planning and economic development. Work was required around productivity drivers and the types of businesses needed in the county. David Owen, on behalf of the LEP, responded on the latter point by noting that the Strategic Economic Plan (signed up to by all councils) did cover this area in detail.

Cllr Steve Jordan noted the importance of sharing the KPMG report with fellow members to allow them to engage in the process. He said that a Strategic Planning Group already existed and he suggested that this be tasked with leading activities in that area.

There was support amongst partners for providing funding but Martin Surl stated that he could only contribute if the remit of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner was included through public service reform. Cllr Mark Hawthorne assured partners that their responsibilities would be covered as part of the work, but there would need to be a particular focus on the priority areas identified in the KPMG report. He noted that community safety was one of those areas.

Agreed

- a) *Each partner to contribute £10,000 towards providing a dedicated resource for Leadership Gloucestershire to take devolution forward.*
- b) *To set up an officer group to draft the job descriptions and identify the wider resources required. The group to include David Owen, Mike Dawson, David Hagg, Pete Bungard and a representative from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.*

Action – *Pete Bungard*

6 ONE GOVERNMENT ESTATE

Neil Corbett, Head of Asset Management and Property at the County Council, presented an update on the latest position. A bid had been made for funding through the One Government Estate Programme.

The outcome of the first stage of the bidding process was expected on 28 October. If successful, £50,000 would be available to develop a case for £500,000 of additional funds to deliver a range of key projects that had been identified by the One Gloucestershire Board. The stage 2 bid needed to be submitted by 16 December and he requested the support of all the partners on Leadership Gloucestershire to meet the tight timescale. Nine projects were included in the bid but there was scope for change as the process moved forward.

Jo Walker noted that the STP process had allowed the bid to be developed with a wider range of health partners. Relationships were also being broadened with other organisations who provided public services such as Ubico.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne welcomed the report and was pleased to see that significant progress was being made in bringing together public assets in Gloucestershire.

7 NEXT MEETING

15 December 2016 at 10am